

OIS 85-284

6 June 1985

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Information Services
FROM: Chief, Classification Review Division
SUBJECT: Experience in Coordination by CRD

1. A review of examples of coordination by CRD with the directorates found 33 examples in various routing sheets we have retained since October 1983. Of these 33 examples, 20 were with the Directorate of Intelligence, nine were with the DO, and four were with DS&T. These 33 examples do not include the 19 FRUS' referred of which all 19 were coordinated with the DI and the DO, nor any of the 40 requests connected with the Westmoreland-CBS lawsuit which were also 100% coordinated with the other directorates and in many cases with other agencies. About 135 other requests were received in CRD during the period--18 damage assessments, 28 FOIA referrals, 40 DOD requests, 29 manuscripts, and 20 other requests--mostly from Congress. Since many of the FOIA requests were merely look-ups of the current classification of NIE's from DARE and some of the manuscripts were coordinated with the other directorates by the PRB, it is obvious that a very high percentage--certainly over half of everything received--was coordinated with the directorates.

2. Of the 33 referrals mentioned above, CRD found classified information in 15 cases and told the directorates what we felt the status of the items should be. In many reviews we do not find any classified information and therefore have no recommendation to make to the coordinating unit. We made no recommendations in the four more technical requests sent to the S&T, feeling that we lacked the competence to do so. Probably the most remarkable fact about the 33 referrals is that in not a single case was there any disagreement between CRD and the directorates. Where CRD made a recommendation, vis-a-vis classification, the directorates agreed, though in nine cases suggested further coordination. In six cases one directorate merely agreed with what the other directorate decided and that was in agreement with the CRD recommendation..

3. We did this study to get an idea of how our recommendations on classification questions have been received in other parts of the Agency. The very high rate of acceptance supports our optimism in believing that we can save the other directorates time and effort in the field of classification/declassification review.


Chief,

Classification Review Division

33 ^{completed} referrals reviewed from Oct 83 - May 85 (50 DI, 9 DO, 4 SGT)
 → CRD reviewed most, made suggestion as far as classif was
 concerned made no recom. for the four SGT
 docs. (felt at time no competence)

In not one case was there any disagreement between
 CRD and the directorates. ^{where CRD made recom., either agreed}
 Directorates suggested additional ^{internal or ext} coordinations ^{III III}
 agreed w. other directorate or DOD ^{III}

Mail Log? ?
 CRD decisions III III III

Types of request that came in at this time - Oct 83 - pre.

Damage Assessment	Westmoreland	FOIA	DOD Systematic & other	manuscripts	Legis other	FRUS?
III III III III (18)	III III III	III III	III III	III	III	III
	III III III	III III	III III	III	III	III
	III III (40)	III III (28)	III III	III	III	III
			III III (40)	III	III (20)	III (19)
				III (29)	III	

135

STAT

Approved For Release 2005/08/24 : CIA-RDP93B01194R001200130008-7

Next 1 Page(s) In Document Exempt

Approved For Release 2005/08/24 : CIA-RDP93B01194R001200130008-7

TO BY
[] ACTION
[] IS WAITING TO SEE YOU
[] WISHES AN APPOINTMENT

1

OFFICE OF SIGINT OPERATIONS
EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Doc No 1

11 April 1984

DDS&T/IRO

Don:

We have reviewed the attached document and inasmuch as the data contained in it is clearly dated, i.e., 1962, see no reason for its continued declassification

[redacted]
classified, then perhaps this document should remain classified. This latter decision, however, is not ours to make.

[redacted]
Jim: Per our conversation of 23 apr, the attached document is referred to the DOD re the OHD sites, otherwise it is unclassified.

27 April 84

Approved For Release 2005/08/24 : CIA-RDP93B01194R001200130008-7

RETURNED
MESSAGE

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

Request for Declassification Review of Another Copy of the Missing
Stanford University through DOD

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)	DATE		OFFICER'S INITIALS	COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)
	RECEIVED	FORWARDED		
STAT <input type="text"/> OIS/CRD 322 Ames Bldg.			<input type="text"/>	NO. ack DATE 20 March 1984
STAT <input type="text"/> DDS&T/IRO 6 E 45 HQDS	22 MAR 84		EH	To No. 1: The attached document entitled "Doppler-Shifted Radio Reflections from Hypersonic Plasma Irregularities" is a copy of the one that we sent to you for review with two other theses from Stanford on 12 Jan 84. We informed you earlier that when you returned the package on 6 Feb 84 after DS&T review, this document was missing. At our request, DOD sent us this copy for review with the stern reminder that we must continue to search for the missing copy. On a priority basis, please have your interested office (OSO/EO, 1 D 11 <input type="text"/>) review this document and return it to us with a recommendation as to declassification, continued classification at the present or lesser level of classification, and/or review by other agencies. Hopefully this copy will jog the memory of your reviewer. Please ask him if he remembers reviewing this thesis with the other two that you returned on 6 Feb. Also remind him to continue the search for the missing copy. Thanks for your assistance. <i>JB</i>
STAT <input type="text"/> OSO/EXO <input type="text"/>				
4. <i>DDST/IRO (6E45HQDS) 25 Apr 84</i>			EH	
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				
STAT 11 <input type="text"/> OIS/CRD 322 AMES BLDG				DECLASSIFIED WHEN SEPARATED FROM ATTACHMENT <i>Per telecon</i> <i>1-3: Bill:</i> <i>Please review as above and return to me with your comments.</i> <i>Thanks.</i> <input type="text"/>
12.				
13.				
14.				
15.				

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

DOD Document on Time Necessary to Develop Missiles

EXTENSION

NO.

CRD/OIS

Rm 322 Ames Bldg.

DATE
14 Nov. 1983

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

1. [] DDS&T/IRO
645 Headquarters Bldg

11 Jan 84 EH

2.

3.

4. NPIC/FIO
BLDG 213

5 Dec 83

5.

6.

7. [] CRD/OIS
322 Ames Bldg.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

1. DOD would like to declassify their document (attached). While all the info is on the time necessary to produce a U.S. missile, the paper was probably developed for the Intelligence Community so they could draw analogies with Soviet production. As you can see, however, the DDI leaves it to you to make any objection, if necessary.

J.O.E.

1-4: NPIC EXO

Jack:

U see no S&T Equities in this document - does NPIC? U would think it would be of interest to DDI, but according to attached they don't. also, if proposed by DOD it is declassifiable by DOD. your comment. etc.

Don:

NPIC agrees with your assessment.

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional) Request for Declassification Review of Three documents from Stanford University through DoD

FROM: OIS/CRD
322 AMES Bldg

EXTENSION

NO.

C-198670

DATE

12 January 1984

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1. DS&T/IRO
6 E 45 HQDS

17 Jan 84 EH

2.

3. OSO/EO

31 Jan 84

4.

5. DDS&T/IRO

6.

7. How the have review attached documents

8.

9. and nothing that remains classified

10.

11. or should be classified the

12.

13. would note that several references

14.

15. are classified and were. I cannot.

16.

17. not reviewed

18.

19. OIS/CRD

20.

21. 322 AMES BLDG

22.

23.

24.

25.

26.

27.

28.

29.

30.

To No. 1:
DoD has sent to us four documents for which the Stanford University Sponsored Projects Office Security Officer has requested a declassification review. Three of these--two theses and a dissertation--are on technical subjects on which we would like to coordinate our response with the appropriate offices in the DS&T. Please have your reviewers recommend declassification, continued classification at the present or lesser level of classification, and/or review by other agencies.

DoD has requested our response by 3 FEBRUARY 1984; therefore we would like to have your response by 1 FEBRUARY 1984. Attached is a list of the THREE documents for your review and the documents. Thanks for your assistance.

OIS/CRD

Please return documents with your comments.

1-3'

request you office review for declass as requested. Please return to me when completed.

Thank you

DDS&T/IRO



ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional) *REPLY TO CRD REQUEST of 12 JAN 84*

FROM:	EXTENSION	NO.
<div>DDS&T IRO 6E45 HQS</div> <i>SH</i>		
	DATE	STAT
	2Feb84	

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)	DATE		OFFICER'S INITIALS	COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)
	RECEIVED	FORWARDED		

1.	OIS/CRD 322 Ames Bldg				<p>Jim: The attached documents were reviewed for declass and are considered to be unclassified and should be handled accordingly. NOTE: several references are classified and were, of course, not reviewed</p> <p>[redacted]</p> <p>DDS&T IRO</p> <p>CRD sent DDS&T /IRO three (3) documents, but only two were returned; Doc no 1 is missing. I contacted [redacted] who claimed he sent on for review everything we sent him. I reminded him that we sent to sign a receipt for 3 documents and returned only 2. He agreed to redo for missing doc.</p> <p>g13.</p>
2.	ATTN; [redacted]				
3.					
4.					
5.					
6.					
7.					
8.					
9.					
10.					
11.					
12.					
13.					
14.					
15.					

ORD-0573-84

3 to 5:

9 MAY 1984

Don:

ORD concurs with your statement that there are no S&T equities in the attached documents.



STAT

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

FROM:

DDS&T/IRO
6E45, Hqs.

EXTENSION

NO.

DATE

1 June 1984

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1. []
OIS/CRD
322 Ames Bldg.

Jim:

There are no S&T equities contained in the attached documents. However, the release of the draft and its listing of "Papers" might stimulate requests for their release, and the "Papers" might still be properly classified - reference Paper No. 5. DDS&T defers to DOD as to declassification of attached documents.

ORD comments appear on the attached routing sheet.

[] initials
d as
reviewer on
classification review
stamp.

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

with 2 Attachments

SUBJECT: (Optional) Request for Declassification Review of Documents from the Defense Department on Maintenance of Technological Superiority dated ~~Sept 1955~~ 1955

FROM: [redacted]

OIS/CRD
322 Ames Bldg

EXTENSION

NO.

DATE

12 April 1984

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1. [redacted] IRO/DDS&T
6 E 45 HQDS

3 May 1984

EH

To No. 1: The Office of the Secretary of Defense has asked us to review the attached ~~xxx~~ and 2 attachments, which they feel contain information of interest to CIA, for a recommendation as to declassification or continued classification at the same or lower level. The documents were issued in 1955 by a Working Group on "Maintenance of Technological Superiority" of the NSC Planning Board. We would like to coordinate our reply with both the DS&T and the DI to which copies of the documents are being sent. May we please have a reply by 15 May 1984. The documents should be returned with your responses. Thanks.

3. ORD/FIO
612 Ames

9 May

5. IRO/DDS&T
Room 6E45, HQS

31 May 84

EH

8. OIS/CRD
322 AMES BLDG

9. ATTN: [redacted]

1 to 3: Ask: I have gone over this paper and do not find any S&T equities herein. Please have someone look at it in your office and comment on the subject matter. Please return to me.



ORD REGIST.

See reverse side for ORD's

Administrative - Internal Use Only

DDS&T-041-85
11 January 1985

MEMORANDUM FOR: Chief, Classification Review Division,
OIS/DDA

STAT

FROM :
Information Review Officer, DDS&T

SUBJECT : Review of Briefing by CIA Director John A.
McCone, 26 Jan 1965

1. I have reviewed the subject briefing and concur with your draft memorandum to OLL. A recommended change to paragraph 1 is indicated on the memorandum. I concur with paragraph 2. In paragraph 3, you could delete the BCO and say you coordinated your review with the Directorate of Science and Technology and they concur in your findings.

2. The DI and DO should also review and comment. If you have any questions, please call me on secure

STAT

STAT

Administrative - Internal Use Only

TOP SECRET

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

FROM:

C/CRD
322 Ames

EXTENSION

NO.

DATE

8 Jan 85

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

1. DS&T/RMO
6E 45 H&S

9 Jan 85

EH

2. ATTN: []

3.

4. C/CRD/OIS
322 AMESBLDG:

14 Jan 85

SK

5. ATTN: []

6.

Jim

7.

Karen - return

8.

to me after you advise others

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

Don - The review job I mentioned on the phone that has the BYEMAN control on it. We would like SRT comments for a reply to OLL & ultimately for their use in a reply to the Senate.

Stan

PS: Pfs advise if others should be in the coordination.

Hto 4: Stan - comments attached to your memo.

25X1

Handle via Byeman Channels Only

UNCLASSIFIED WHEN SEPARATED



TOP SECRET

7 February 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR: DO/Information Review Officer

25X1 FROM:

[REDACTED]
Acting Chief, East Asia Division

SUBJECT: Review of Packet from OIS/Classification Review Division (CRD)

REFERENCES: A. Pink Cover Sheet from C/OIS/CRD, 13 October 1983
B. Memorandum from Joint Chiefs of Staff (SM-574-83), 11 August 1983

1. East Asia Division has reviewed the packet (12 documents) forwarded under references. We have marked alongside individual document references an indication of whether we agree to release for review ("ok") or not ("no"), or "defer." Release of any documents to the State historians should, of course, be for their background review only. Should the historians wish to use any of these documents in the Foreign Relations of the United States (FRUS) series, we would require a separate request to that effect and the Division would then re-review the documents in question. Because of the nature of most of the material in the referenced packet, it is doubtful that the Division would release any or part of these documents for use in the FRUS publication.

2. The Division spent 4 hours reviewing these documents.

[REDACTED]

25X1

[REDACTED]

25X1

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

Review of Packet from OIS/Classification Review Division (CRD)

FROM:

A/CEA
5 D 00 Hqs

EXTENSION

NO.

DATE

8 February 1984

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1. DO/IRO
1 D 4109 Hqs

13/2 14/2

D

163: See attached EA
memo.
Lar.

2.

3. C/CRD
322 Ames Bldg.

27 Feb 84 SK

4.

5. Jim E.

27 FEB 84 KIE

your action

6.

5. to 7. Max - here are the documents you forwarded to us on 23 August 83 - we received them from the DO only today. In your response to DOD I'd stress paragraph one of [redacted]

7. IPD/OIS
Attn: [redacted][redacted] letter of 7 February - namely that the DO does not oppose the release of some of the documents so marked to state for background use only for their historians, but NOT for use in FRUS without a resubmission to us for that purpose and the DO would probably refuse to approve their use in FRUS.
[redacted]

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

Review of Referral Packet from National Defense University

FROM:

A/CEA

5 D 00 Hqs

EXTENSION

NO.

DATE

10 Feb 84

STAT

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1. DO/IRO
1 D 4109 Hqs

13/2

14/2

D

1 to 3: See attached
EA memo.
Lan.

2.

3. C/CRD
322 Ames Bldg.

24 Feb 84

JK

4.

5. Jim E

JE

3-5: What are the Historians
"own guidelines"?

6.

7. Stan K. sign
where paper
clipped5-7
Suggested answer attached.

8.

9. Karen

- Type on back of DA form
1575

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

25X1



3. I informed Mr. Thompson that I would check with the DO to see if they were aware of any records in their holdings related to this matter and whether they had any comment relative to liaison equities. Since Thompson plans to have his reply drafted by 2 March 1984, I promised to try and have a response to him by that date. Your comments would be appreciated and, if possible, by 2 March. (U)

25X1



Attachments:
As Stated

25X1 DDA/OIS/CRD/[redacted] (27 Feb 84)

Distribution:

25X1 Orig - Addressee w/att
1 - [redacted] w/att
✓ 1 - CRD Liaison w/NARS w/att
1 - CRD Chrono w/o att

25X1 NOTE FOR THE RECORD: [redacted] informed me that the DO had no interest in these documents since they felt that there was no CIA equity involved.

c/CRD

STAT

Approved For Release 2005/08/24 : CIA-RDP93B01194R001200130008-7

Approved For Release 2005/08/24 : CIA-RDP93B01194R001200130008-7

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional) Mandatory Declassification Review Request on Two Documents from the John F. Kennedy Library

FROM: [] CRD/OIS
322 Ames Bldg

EXTENSION

NO.

DATE

24 May 1984

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1. [] IRO/DO
1D4109 HQDS

22/6

[Signature]

To No 1
USIA sent us the attached two documents for declassification review in connection with a mandatory review request from the J. F. Kennedy Library. Each document is a memo from Edward R. Murrow of interest to CIA. The document marked # 3, dated March 9, 1962, classified SECRET, is for the President. The document marked no. 6, dated 5 April 1963, classified TOP SECRET is to McGeorge Bundy. Because both documents discuss DO projects, we would like to coordinate our response with you for a recommendation as to declassification, continued classification at present or lesser level, or sanitization. Please cite reasons for your decision under EO 12356 and return the documents to us. Thanks for your assistance. *JB*.

UNCLASSIFIED UPON REMOVAL OF ATTACHMENTS

10. [] CRD/OIS
322 AMES BLDG

6/26

JB

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

FROM:

C/CRD
322 Ames Bldg

EXTENSION

NO.

DATE

20 June 1984

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1. DO/ IRO
ID 4135 Hdas

2. Attn: [redacted]

27/6

D

3. C/IRB

27/7/84

lee

4.

5. DO/ IRO

3/7

J

6. ID 4109,
Attn: [redacted]

7.

8. C/CRD

6 July 84

JK

9. 322 Ames Bldg.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

Lou - This is the OSS report I discussed with you this morning. It concerns surrender talks held in Switzerland and No. Italy just prior to the end of WWII. We were asked to review it for declassification by NARS who had received a request from [redacted]

In his book The Secret Surrender, Allan Dulles gives the names of his two Swiss contacts; (pgs 26 & 27), and provides much of the detail of the event. Another book on this subject is Operation Sunrise by Bradley Smith and Elena Agarossi.

Please let me know whether you find this report unclassified or not.

JK
Thanks,

1 to 3:

Please have Ed take a look at this and be sure we don't have anything to delete. Thanks.

Lee.

to 3:

All the info in this report has been on the public record since at least the mid-60s; notably, in Allen's own book. Thus, release in entirety.

1 to 3: DO has no problem with this. Lou.

Ed
2 July

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

Excerpts from classified briefings for classification review

FROM:

OIS/CRD
322 Ames

EXTENSION

NO.

DATE

19 July 1984

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S
INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1.

DO/IRO

19/7

20/7

②

Lou

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

OIS/CRD
322 Ames

Thy

A

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

Attached are excerpts from classified briefings by Mr. Colby of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Classification review is requested, since in keeping with its rules, they would like to declassify. Could you have them reviewed and returned to us for return to OSD.

1 to 6:

I do not see anything in the attached extract that requires continued protection. In the DO view the extracts are declassified

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional) US Senate Foreign Relations Committee Request for Declassification of Classified Briefing Excerpts

FROM:
OIS/CRD
322 AMES

EXTENSION

NO.

DATE

2 August 1984

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1 DO/IRO
1D4109 HQDS

2/8/84

20/8/84

[Signature]

To No 1 Addressee:
OLL referred to us the attached declassification review request from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, dated 11 July 1984. It covers excerpts from classified briefings of 25 Feb and 29 July 1966, and 23 Jan 1968, all classified TOP SECRET. We reviewed the attached excerpts and found only one item that should be withheld. This item is bracketed on lines 9-11, page 120 of the 2/25/66 briefing.

Because of the sensitive nature of some of this material, we would like to coordinate our reply with the interested offices in the DO and the DI to whose IROs we are sending separate copies. Please let us know whether or not you find any additional material that you believe should be withheld. Please indicate your reasons under EO 12356, sign the green cover sheet, and return the documents with your comments. Thanks for your assistance. *gib*

DECLASSIFIED WHEN SEPARATED FROM ATTACHMENTS

2. *LA/PEM 5*
3. *3C-2006*

6 Sept 84

1 to 6: These are mostly LA equities. Pls review and see if you are in agreement w/CRD's recommendations. Pls return to me. *gib*

11. *DO/IRO*
12. *1D4109*

6/9/84

[Signature]

14. OIS/CRD
322 AMES Bldg

7 Sept 84

gib

Don't like to see this declassified but agree with the recommendation. I'll do alternative. *gib*

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

FROM:

C/CRD

EXTENSION

NO.

DATE

24 Dec 84

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1. DO/IRO
ID 4135/HQS

26/12

28/12

[Signature]

Low - Note deadline of 28 Dec. We are asking for a little more time and will let you know.

2. ATTN

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

C/CRD

PS: Copy also sent to DI/IRO.

1 to 7: I have marked in yellow all deletions to be made.
Low.

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

Manuscript on Soviet Ground Forces by William Baxter (L of C.)

FROM: [REDACTED] CRD/OIS/DDA
322 Ames Bldg.

NO. 015 85-060

DATE
4 Febr. 1985

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1. [REDACTED] DO/IRO
1D4109 Headquarters

5/2

D

1. Lou,
The attached manuscript is by a Library of Congress contract researcher, and received from LC via PRB. Mr. Baxter has no CIA clearance.

3. [REDACTED] 5 FEB 1985
513-4803

Jogged

The information in the manuscript seems to come primarily from Russian ~~xxxxxxx~~ monographs and Soviet military periodicals, which would be available to Mr. Baxter at the Library of Congress, and are ostensibly unclassified.

4. [REDACTED] 8 FEB 1985

8 FEB

RA

The question is - were any of the Soviet journals procured by us? and if this book is published, would it make the future procurement of them any more difficult??

5. [REDACTED] 11 FEB 1985

11 FEB 1985

SM

CRD could find nothing in the substance of the book to justify denial.

6. [REDACTED] 13/2/85

13/2/85

D

7. [REDACTED]

8. [REDACTED]

9. [REDACTED]

10. [REDACTED]

11. 322 Ames

1 to 3: Shirley - Please look at CRD's comments & let me know if this presents any problem for you. Lou.

12. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Can you please have some one look at this Thanks

13. [REDACTED]


14. [REDACTED]

4 to all: No problems all over & done

15. [REDACTED]

6 to 10: No problem for DO.

610 USE PREVIOUS EDITIONS



GPO : 1983 O - 411-632

STAT

Approved For Release 2005/08/24 : CIA-RDP93B01194R001200130008-7

Approved For Release 2005/08/24 : CIA-RDP93B01194R001200130008-7

TOP SECRET

ACTION SHEET

REC'D IN IC 26 October 1983		IC # A218822	
DESCRIPTION OF ATTACHED MATERIAL:			
TYPE OF MATERIAL DOD Request		DATED 24 October 1983	
FROM DOD		TO CRD/OIS	
SUBJECT Ascertain your views as to whether or not these notes can be released in their entirety			
DELIVERED TO 322 Ames		DEADLINE DATE 12 December 1983	FOLLOW-UP DATE 23 December 1983

DIVISION ROUTING

TO	DATE	ACTION REQUIRED	INIT.	COMMENTS
1. Jim E.			JE	#4 to #'s 1 & 2:
2. Jim B.	10 Jan	Review	JB	After signing the green sheets and cards, please return entire package to me before starting to review. Thank you. Karen Karen
3. Jim E.	10 Jan		JE	
4. Karen R.	11 Jan		KR	
5. Stan K.		Sign	SK	
6. Karen R.				
				Delay caused by PDI review. Docs sent to 1 Nov 83, were returned on 9 Jan 84. Copies for CRD file attached in bottom of this stack.

25X1

INSTRUCTIONS: Under each comment a line should be drawn across sheet and each comment numbered to correspond with the number in the "TO" Column.

TOP SECRET

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional) Request for Declassification Review of Three "Notes" made during research for the memoirs of Paul H. Nitze

FROM: [redacted] CRD/OIS
322 Ames Bldg.

EXTENSION NO.

DATE
1 Nov 83

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

[redacted] IRO/DI
2 E 6104 HQDS

3 Nov 83 PC

To No. 1

The attached three documents are Notes made during research for the memoirs of P.H. Nitze, taken from documents dated ~~30X000X07X~~ 25 Jan 67, 11 Sep 63, and 30 May 63, all TS. DOD asks us to ascertain if these notes may be used in preparation of the Nitze book which will be published in unclassified form. In view of the specialized subject matter of the notes, we would like to coordinate our response with the interested offices in the DI for a recommendation as to whether these notes may be released. If the judgment is that the notes cannot be released in their entirety, please indicate those portions which need to be excised to make them releasable. We shall require a look at the finished manuscript also. Please sign TS Green Sheets as well as regular mail receipt. Thanks. JB

2.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

NIC (sent 8 Dec 83)

2 Nov 83 mgB

DI/IRO

9 Jan 84 R

2 documents sent to NIC
for review and returned
herewith

A 21882

5 Dec 83

Date

AND TRANSMITTAL SLIP

	office symbol, room number.	Initials	Date
1.		STAT	
2.	C/CRV		
3.		STAT	
4.			
5.			

Action	File	Note and Return
Approval	For Clearance	Per Conversation
As Requested	For Correction	Prepare Reply
Circulate	For Your Information	See Me
Comment	Investigate	Signature
Coordination	Justify	

REMARKS

I have reviewed the attached documents and have no objection to the declassification and release of the two TS items.

I agree with the DO that the two items from NSAM 192 should remain classified at the Secret level.

STAT

DO NOT use this form as a RECORD of approvals, concurrences, disposals, clearances, and similar actions

FROM: (Name, org. symbol, Agency/Post)

Room No.—Bldg.

--

DOO request A 218812
 2/80 : 1981 O - 361-529 (178)

OPTIONAL FORM 41 (Rev. 7-76)
 Prescribed by GSA
 FPMR (41 CFR) 101-11.206

TOP SECRET

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

Request for Declassification Review of two "Notes" Made during Research for the Memoirs of Paul H. Nitze

FROM [Redacted]
CRD/OIS
322 AMES BLDG

EXTENSION

NO.

DATE 29 February 1984

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1. [Redacted] IRO/DI
2 E 6104 HQDS

RECEIVED FORWARDED

To No. 1: Another Nitze book "Notes": The attached two documents are copies of "Notes" made during research of Office of the Secty of Defense documents: The first is from a Memcon dated 12 Dec 1967, designated HR-Nitze-98, classified SECRET; the second is from a Memo dated 13 Mar 1967, designated HR-Nitze-104, classified TOP SECRET.

DOD asks us to ascertain if these notes may be used in preparation of the unclassified Nitze book. In view of the specialized subject matter of the notes, we would like to coordinate our response with the interested offices in the DI for a recommendation as to whether these notes may be released in whole or in part. Please designate which. These notes have been reviewed by OASD (Int'l Security Policy) which has no objection to their release, except for bracketed portion of Attachment 1, subject to CIA concurrence. Attachment 1 is also being reviewed by State Dept. Attachment 2 has previously been examined by Arms Control and Disarmament Agcy which posed no objection to its release.

Please sign TS Green Sheet as well as regular mail receipt. Thanks. JB

UNCLASSIFIED WHEN SEPARATED FROM ENCLOSURES

DOD requests reply by 26 March 1984.

2. *12 Mar 84 PL*
3. *DI poses no objection*
4. *to release of the*
5. *attached Nitze notes*
6. *as sanitized by*
7. *OASD.*
8. *Paul*

15. [Redacted]
OIS/CRD
322 AMES BLDG

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional) Request for Declassification Review of Four "Notes" Made During Research for the memoirs of Paul H. Nitze

25X1	FROM: XXXXXXXXXXXX [Redacted] CRD/OIS 322 AMES BLDG	EXTENSION [Redacted]	NO. DATE 7 Feb 84	25X1
25X1	TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)	DATE RECEIVED FORWARDED	OFFICER'S INITIALS	COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)
	[Redacted] IRO/DI 2 E 6104 HQDS	16 Feb 84	PL	To No. 1: The attached four documents are "Notes" made during research of OSD documents dated 29 Mar 68, 29 Dec 67, 22 Aug 68, and 22 Aug 68; Notes 1, 3 and 4 are from TS docs; No 2 is CONF. DOD asks us to ascertain if these notes may be used in preparation of the Nitze book which will be published in unclassified form. In view of the specialized subject matter of the notes, we would like to coordinate our response with the interested offices in the DI for a recommendation as to whether these notes may be released. If the judgment is that the notes cannot be released in their entirety, PLEASE INDICATE THOSE PORTIONS WHICH NEED TO BE EXCISED TO MAKE THEM RELEASABLE. We shall require a look at the finished manuscript also. Please sign TS Green Sheets as well as regular mail receipt. List of Notes also attached. Thanks. JB
25X1	3. ACIS-6F20	7 Feb 1984	OK	
25X1	4. [Redacted] OSWR	12 Mar 84	mg	
	[Redacted] IRO/DI 2 E 6104 HQ	14 Mar 84	PL	
25X1	7. [Redacted] VIC 7E47 HQS	27 Mar 84	U	
25X1	14. [Redacted] DI 1120	28 Mar 84	PL	1-3 Please review attached for note above. Let me know if you think it should be reviewed in other DI or S&T segments. Please return by 22 Feb. 3-1 Recommend sending to OSWR and NIO/SP for review.

SECRET

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

DOD Manuscript Intelligence Policy and Process

FROM:
C/CRD/OIS/DA
322 Ames Building

EXTENSION

NO.

OIS 85-145

DATE

18 April 1984

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

1. IRO/DI
2E6104 Hqs. Building

24 April 85 JR

Request for review of attached manuscript is requested.

2.

3.

Stan

4.

5.

Will?

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

Other than the portion you cited on p. 33, I found nothing else that need be deleted/changed.

DI/IRDO

DOWNGRADE TO CONFIDENTIAL
WHEN SEPARATED FROM
ATTACHMENT

SECRET

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional) Request for Declassification Review of 16 "Notes" from SALT discussion Records dated 1968-1969, Made during Research for Memoirs of Paul H Nitze

FROM: [redacted]
OIS/ Classification Review Div
322 AMES Bldg

NO. [redacted]
DATE
20 April 1984

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

[redacted] IRO/DDI
2 E 6104 HQDS

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

To All Addressees:
The attached 16 documents are "Notes" made during research of OSD records for memoirs of Paul Nitze. All but 3 are from TS records (List attached). DOD asks us to ascertain if these Notes may be used in preparation of Nitze's unclassified book. In view of specialized subject of Notes, we would like to coordinate our response with interested offices in DDI for recommendation as to whether these notes may be released. If a Note cannot be released in its entirety, please indicate portions which need to be excised to make it releasable, and cite justification in EO 12356. DOD stated these Notes have been reviewed by US Arms Control & Disarmament Agcy, which has no objection to their release subject to CIA concurrence. Notes being reviewed by State, JCS, & Deputy Asst Secty of Defense for Negotiations Policy, Int'l Security Policy (Multilateral Negotiations). Please sign TS Green Sheets as well as regular mail receipt. Thanks for your assistance. JB
DOD asked for our reply by 17 May 84.

2.

3.

4.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

DI 1120
2 E 6104

[redacted] OIS/CRD
322 AMES Bldg

1 Jun 84

JB

1-3
Please review attached notes - bracket any material that is classified.

1-5
OSWR pres no objection to declassification of attached & suggests ACIS also review.

SECRET

B143695

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional) Request for Declassification Review of Sketches of Research & Development Trends and Personalities in Scientific & Military Weapons Fields in West Germany

FROM: [] OIS/CRD
322 Ames Bldg

EXTENSION

NO.

DATE

7 June 1984

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

1. [] DI/IRO
2E 6104 HQDS

14 June 84 PC

2.

[]
EUR A56-44

18 June 84 A

4.

[]

25 June 26 June DB

5.

OSWR

6.

7. Cline Rine
OCL

27 JUN 1984

8.

9. C/IS9 (looks to me like this center directorate - any problems?)
C/IEUR
D/OCL

29 JUN 1984

10.

[]
DI/IRO

3 July 84 PC

11.

12.

13.

14. [] OIS/CRD
322 Ames Bldg

3 July 84 5 June 84

15.

To all Addressees:
The attached 12 sketches from Office of Secretary of Defense files were sent to us for declassification review with request that we recommend declassification, continued classification at the present or lesser levels of classification, and/or review by other agencies. In view of their specialized subject matter we would like to coordinate our response with interested offices in the DDI. OSD requested our reply by 30 July 1984. Please return the documents with your reply. Thanks for your assistance. JB

1-3-5-7
Does anyone have any objection to the declassification of the attached?

3-10
Don't know who in Eur would address this. Has OSWR had a look at it?

5-10
OSWR has no objections to declassification of UNCLASSIFIED attached documents WHEN SEPARATED

8-9910
EUR has no objection to the declassification of attached documents.

SECRET

30 May 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR: Information Review Officer, DI

25X1 FROM:

[REDACTED]
National Intelligence Officer for Warning

SUBJECT:

[REDACTED]

25X1

1. I concur with DDA and DIA that [REDACTED] work should remain classified.

25X1

2. The work, which was completed in 1978, is a landmark project which chronicles several aspects of the performance of the U.S. indications and warning apparatus during past crises, including the discussion of several potential vulnerabilities, and would thus be a valuable source for Soviet exploitation.

3. Although the work is dated, the background data identifies the theory of and techniques still in use in the indicating and warning process.

[REDACTED]

25X1

25X1

4 JUNE 1984

Date

11 June 84

TRANSMITTAL SLIP

Office symbol room number		Initials	Date
1. [Redacted]			
2. C.R.D.			
3.			
4.			
5.			

Action	File	Note and Return
Approval	For Clearance	Per Conversation
As Requested	For Correction	Prepare Reply
Circulate	For Your Information	See Me
Comment	Investigate	Signature
Coordination	Justify	

REMARKS

Jim,
 See attached note
 from NIO/Warming.
 Paul

DO NOT use this form as a RECORD of approvals, concurrences, disposals, clearances, and similar actions

FROM: (Name, org. symbol, Agency/Post)

Room No.—Bldg.

Phone No.

5041-102

OPTIONAL FORM 41 (Rev. 7-76)
Prescribed by GSA
FPMR (41 CFR) 101-11.205

* GPO : 1981 O - 361-525 (148)

CRD L1415000 full

B143732

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional) Request for Declassification Review of 15 documents on Chemical and Biological Warfare experiments in USSR & Satellites and Nazi Germany

FROM: [Redacted]
Classification Review Div/OIS
322 Ames Bldg

NO.

DATE
15 June 1984

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1. [Redacted] IRO/DI
2E 6104 HQDS Bldg

19 June 84 PC

2. [Redacted]
3. [Redacted]

OSD R 51-46 HQS

To all addressees:
Under its systematic review program the Office of the Secretary of Defense sent us the attached 15 documents with request that we recommend declassification, continued classification at present or lesser levels of classification, and/or review by other agencies. In view of the specialized subject matter we would like to coordinate our response with interested offices in the DDI. Since OSD requested our reply within 60 days, we would appreciate your response with the documents by 3 Aug 84. A list of the 15 documents is also attached. Thanks for your assistance. JB

DECLASSIFIED WHEN SEPARATED FROM ATTACHMENTS
(Please cite reasons for your decisions under EO 12356)

1-3 The attached are old but with the exception of a very few, I believe they should remain classified. What thinks OSWR?

3-10- Yes, these documents should remain classified.

CIA had already held these.

10. [Redacted]
DI / IRO

27 June 84 PC

14. [Redacted] CRD/OIS
322 Ames Bldg.

28 June

JB

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional) Request for Declassification Review of OSD Document Concerning a Small Scientific Satellite

FROM:
OIS/CRD
322 Ames Bldg

NO.

DATE 2 July 1984

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

1. DDI/IRO
2E 6104 Headquarters

To all Addressees:
Under its systematic review program the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) sent us the attached document with request that we recommend declassification, continued classification at present or lesser levels, and/or review by other agencies. In view of its subject--small scientific satellite--we would like to coordinate our reply with interested offices in the DDI. Since OSD asked for our reply within 60 days, we would appreciate your response with the document by 29 August 84. Please cite reason for your decision under EO 12356. Thanks for your assistance.
DECLASSIFIED WHEN SEPARATED
FROM ATTACHMENT

Recommend the attached memo be downgraded to Confidential.

15. OIS/CRD
322 Ames Bldg

SECRET

CONFIDENTIAL LIAISON

B 143748

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional) Request for Declassification Review of two documents on Atomic Energy

FROM: [Redacted]
OIS/CRD
322 AMES Bldg

EXTENSION

NO.

C-956354

DATE

22 June 1984

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

1. [Redacted] IRO/DI
2E 6104 Headquarters Bldg

To No. 1:
Under its systematic review program the Office of the Secretary of Defense sent us the attached two documents with request that we recommend declassification, continued classification at present or lesser levels of classification, and/or review by other agencies. The documents are concerned with atomic energy. In view of the specialized subject we would like to coordinate our response with interested offices in the DDI. Since OSD requested our reply within 60 days, we would appreciate your response with the documents by 15 August 84. Please cite reasons for your decisions under EO 12356. Thanks for your assistance. *JB*
DECLASSIFIED WHEN SEPARATED FROM ATTACHMENTS

No objection to the declassification of the items attached.

12. [Redacted] OIS/CRD
322 AMES Bldg

5 Jul 84

JB

[Redacted]

*DI 1120
3 July 1984*

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional) Request for Declassification Review of Two Documents w/5 Attachments on Guided Missiles

FROM: [REDACTED]
OIS/CRD
322 AMES BLDG

EXTENSION

NO.

DATE

28 June 1984

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1. [REDACTED] DI/IRO
2E 6104 Headquarters

3 July 84 PC

2.

3.

6 July 84 PF

4. [REDACTED] DI/IRO
2E 6104 Hqrs

10 July 84 PC

5.

6.

11 July

SOVA

7. [REDACTED] DI/IRO
2E 6104 Hqrs

15 July

8.

declassif

9.

10.

11.

DI/IRO

18 July 84 PC

12.

2E-6104 Hqrs

13.

14. [REDACTED] OIS/CRD
322 AMES BLDG

15.

To No 1 Addressee:
UNDER its systematic review program the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) sent us the attached two documents with request that we recommend declassification, continued classification at present or lesser levels of classification, and/or review by other agencies. The second attached document has three attachments and the second of those itself has two attachments; all are listed on the attached list of attachments, a total of 47 pages. The documents concern guided missile R & D. In view of the specialized subject we would like to coordinate our reply with interested offices in the DDI. Since OSD requested our reply within 60 days, we would appreciate your response with the documents by 21 August 84. Please cite reasons for your decisions under EO 12356. Thanks for your assistance. JKB
DECLASSIFIED WHEN SEPARATED FROM ATTACHMENTS

1-3 & 6
Any direction to
declassifying the
attached?

This really should go to SOVA; it deals with production of guided missiles--not R&D. Don't think there is any sensitive CIA info in the document.

C/ES/OSWR

6 to 11

SOVA has no objection to the

declassification

CRD file copy

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

Foreign Relations Committee

SUBJECT: (Optional) US Senate/Request for Declassification of Classified Briefing Excerpts

FROM:

OIS/CRD
322 AMES Bldg

NO.

DATE

2 August 1984

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

DI/IRO
2E 6104 HQDS

6 Aug 84 PC

To No. 1 Addressee:
OLL referred to us the attached declassification review request from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, dated 11 July 1984. It covers excerpts from classified briefings of 25 Feb 1966; 29 July 1966; and 23 Jan 1968, all classified TOP SECRET. We reviewed the attached excerpts and found only one item that should be withheld. This item is bracketed on lines 9-11 on page 120 of the 2/25/66 briefing. Because of the sensitive nature of some of this material, we would like to coordinate our reply with the interested offices in the DO and the DI to whose IROs we are sending separate copies. Please let us know whether or not you find any additional material that you believe should be withheld. Please indicate your reasons under EO 12356, sign the green cover sheet, and return the documents with your comments. Thanks for your assistance. JB

DECLASSIFIED WHEN SEPARATED
FROM ATTACHMENTS

The DI poses no objection to the declassification of the attached pages. The DI defers to the DO re. the sensitivity of the portions bracketed.

OIS/CRD
322 AMES Bldg

8 Aug 84 JB

DI/IRO

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

FROM:

DDO/DO/IRO
1D4109 CIA HQS
Tube # HT-1

EXTENSION

NO.

DATE

9 August 1984

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1. NE Division

Kathy,

We have been asked by the DDI to review the attached papers on a South Asia Trip Report by [redacted] of the DDI for classification. Could you or someone on the desks review and identify any classified info contained therein.

Thank you,

Lou

5.

6.

7. DO/IRO
HT-1

14/8

D

8-11

8.

9.

DI/120

16 Aug 84

On second thought, I agree in the DO decision to classify, Confil.

Paul

10.

11.

8/17

12.

OIS/CRD

13.

14.

15.

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

FROM:

DDO/DO/IRO
1D4109 CIA HQS
Tube # HT-1

EXTENSION

NO.

DATE

9 August 1984

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1. NE Division

ATTN: [REDACTED]

2.

NE/ [REDACTED]

3.

NE/ [REDACTED]

4.

5.

6.

7. DO/IRO
HT-1

14/8

[Signature]

8-11

8.

DI/120

16 Aug 84

9.

On second thought, I concur in the DO decision to classify, Confil.

Paul

10.

11.

8/17

12.

OIS/CRD

13.

14.

15.

Approv

STAT

MEMORANDUM FOR:

DI/IRO
2E6104

SOVA has reviewed the attached papers and
has determined that they are unclassified.

Date

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

New Perspectives on Soviet Thinking: the Systems Approach

FROM:

DA/OIS/CRD
322 Ames

EXTENSION

NO.

84-3196

DATE

14 August 1984

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1. DI/IRO
2E6104 HQ

16 Aug 84 PC

Paul:

We received the attached paper from DOD with a request for review for classification. The author wants to submit it for publication to AU Review.

2.

3.

SOVA

4.

5.

We would appreciate it if you could have it reviewed, and get it back to us prior to 24 August, which is the deadline date they have set.

Thankx

6.

7.

8.

9.

10. DA/OIS/CRD
322 Ames

8/27

L

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional) Request for Declassification Review of a document concerning the Release of Information on Fission Yields of Soviet Tests

FROM:
OIS/CRD
322 Ames Bldg

EXTENSION

NO.

DATE

21 Nov 1984

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1. DI/IRO
2E 6104 Headquarters

10 Dec 84 PC

2. OSWR/NED
5 G 48 Headquarters

24 Dec

MC

3.

4.

5.

DI/IRO
2E 6104

2 Jan 85 PC

6.

7.

5-9

see note from OSWR.

8.

9.

OIS/CRD
322 AMES Bldg

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

To No. 1 Addressee: (and No. 2) In view of specialized subject of attached document, I discussed it on secure line with who asked that the document be forwarded to him for declassification review. We received this doc. from the Office of the Secretary of Defense under its systematic review program with request that we recommend declassification, continued classification at present or lesser levels and/or review by other agencies. If doc. cannot be released, please cite reasons for decision under EO 12356. We shall prepare formal reply to OSD. Thanks for your assistance.

DECLASSIFIED WHEN SEPARATED FROM ATTACHMENT

1-2

Please review, comment re. declassification and return to me.

2-5 Looks unclassified * but we suggest checking with DoE to make sure that there's no problem with the measurement of fission yield vice total yield (we think it's OK).

SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

DIS 85-003

FROM:

C/CRD

EXTENSION

NO.

DATE

24 Dec 84

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1.

DI/IRO
2E6104 Hqs

31 Dec 84 PC

2.

ATTN: [REDACTED]

3.

[REDACTED]

ALA

31 Dec

3 Jan 85

CB

Paul - Note Deadline of 28 Dec. We are asking for an extension and will let you know. Also coordinating with the DO.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

[REDACTED]

DI/IRO

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

Stan:
DI agrees with CRD deletions and recommends no additional deletions

DI/IRO

3 Jan 85

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

Coordination Review Request

03 85-007

FROM: C/CRD
322 Ames Bldg.

EXTENSION

NO.

DATE 8 January 1985

25X1

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1. IRO/DI
2E6104 Hqs. Bldg.

11 Jan 85 PC 1-3

2.

3.

[Redacted]

16 Jan 85 DG

4.

[Redacted]

DI/IRO 2E6104

18 Jan 85 PM/sne

5.

6.

OSWR

[Redacted]

23 Jan 85 PF

7.

8.

9.

[Redacted]

10.

DI/IRO

25 Jan 85

PM/1980

11.

12.

C/CRD

28 Jan 85 SK

13.

Jim

14.

15.

Do you agree with the recommendations, re. refined docs, that are contained in the attached memo from C/CRD?

Please comment and return by 21 Jan.

UNCLASSIFIED WHEN SEPARATED FROM ATTACHMENTS

Real

See memo in CRO's memo if D/OSWR does too. You need to check.

6. C/ACIS asks for concurrence of DD/OSWR
6-10 - [Signature] Jim by OSWR

25X1

FORM 1-79

610

USE PREVIOUS EDITIONS

SECRET

1632

25X1

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

Rand Note: Latin American Terrorism:
Violence by Anti-Castro Cubans

FROM:

DO/IRO
1D4109 CIA HQS

EXTENSION

NO.

DATE

22 April 1985

STAT

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S
INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1. DI/IRO
2E6104 CIA HQS
ATTN:

24 Apr 85 PC

I concur in the
attached comments
prepared by my
DO counterpart.3. C/CRD
322 AMES Bldg.

4. Bob

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

STAT

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

FROM:

C/CRD
322 Ames

EXTENSION

NO.

DATE

16 May 1985

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1. DI/IRO
2E6104 Hqs

22 May 85

PC

ATTN:

Paul - A brief article submitted for prepubl review by DoD. We were not sent the other chapters. We have no problems with this one. Please look it over from your viewpoint. Note they would like a reply by 17 May.

Stan

No problem from the standpoint of classification.

10. C/CRD
322 Ames Bldg

STAT

DI/120

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

NIE 63-59

FROM:

[redacted] CRD/OIS
Rm. 322 Ames Bldg.

EXTENSION

[redacted]

NO.

DATE

21 May 1985

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1. [redacted] DI /IRO
2E6104 Headquarters

21 May 85 PC

Paul:

The History Office at State has asked (via [redacted] CDC) to use the Conclusions only (pages 1 & 2) of this NIE in their '59-60 Vietnam FRUS. We had downgraded the entire doct. to Conf. under systematic review in 1981. However, neither John [redacted] not I can see a ny problem with the release of the conclusions. While there are troop numbers in the annex I think this was too early to figure in the CBS-Westmoreland action. What do you think ?

J.O.E.

No objection to the use of the Conclusions section of the attached NIE as unclassified

DI / IRO

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)

NIE 63-59

FROM:

[redacted] CRD/OIS
Rm. 322 Ames Bldg.

EXTENSION

[redacted]

NO.

DATE

21 May 1985

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

1. [redacted] DI /IRO
2E1014 Headquarters

Paul:

The History Office at State has asked (via [redacted] CDC) to use the Conclusions only (pages 1 & 2) of this NIE in their '59-60 Vietnam FRUS. We had downgraded the entire doct. to Conf. under systematic review in 1981. However, neither [redacted] not I can see a ny problem with the release of the conclusions. While there are troop numbers in the annex I think this was too early to figure in the CBS-Westmoreland action. What do you think ?

J.O.E.

[redacted]
322 Ames

23 May
No objections to use of pp. 1-2
conclusions. P.M.

*Jim
Collate
SK*

*Material for Survey
of liaison w DI + DO*

1RO/DI

1RO/DO

1RO/DS+T

Total #

20

9

4

Agree

20

6

4

*# Added
Deletions*

0

2

0

*# Half
Half*

0

1

0

As of March 1979 there were
45,000,000 total pages to be reviewed
17% are DDO or

7,650,000 pages

110,241 pages reviewed in 1979

630,271 pages reviewed in 1980

740,512 total pages reviewed

7,650,000

- 740,512

6,909,488 remain to be reviewed as
of Jan 1981

10.9 yrs required to review 6,909,000 pgs
@ 630,000 pgs per yr.

or

863,686 pgs per yr to finish in 8 yrs

27 January 1981

Systematic Review in 1980

<u>Period</u>	<u>Docs</u>	<u>Pgs</u>	<u>M-Hrs</u>	<u>Pgs/M-Hr</u>	<u>NC</u>	<u>DNGR</u>	<u>UPGR</u>	<u>DECLASS</u>
31 Dec - 4 Jan	208	2908	51	57	6	194	0	1
7 - 11 Jan	293	6690	99.5	67.2	137	104	2	50
14 - 18 Jan	428	7697	109	70.6	26	200	0	0
21 - 25 Jan	175	5490	87.5	62.7	7	168	0	0
28 Jan - 1 Feb	442	11651	196.5	59.3	21	337	6	78
4 - 8 Feb	942	8006	116	69	113	582	17	217
11 - 15 Feb	869	7983	142.5	56	156	509	4	27
18 - 22 Feb	639	5304	89	59.6	36	548	8	0
25 - 29 Feb	1318	6880	138	49.8	137	1137	7	37
3 - 7 Mar	884	4529	106.5	42.5	81	674	8	89
10 - 14 Mar	862	4635	117	39.6	108	586	5	70
17 - 21 Mar	1228	4699	126	37.3	133	988	11	76
24 - 28 Mar	1512	4890	133.5	36.6	147	1192	15	158
31 Mar - 4 Apr	1019	8534	118	72.3	119	818	5	45
7 - 11 Apr	709	13266	102	130	78	500	3	44
14 - 18 Apr	169	11407	42	271.6	9	152	8	0
21 - 25 Apr	476	29311	117	250.5	107	240	0	48
28 Apr - 2 May	1167	5346	109	49	189	781	17	156
5 - 9 May	910	9568	120.5	79.4	122	738	0	50
12 - 16 May	1046	11901	104.5	113.9	118	567	8	116
19 - 23 May	422	7520	56.5	133	26	257	2	29
26 - 30 May	70	2844	15	189.6	0	28	0	0
2 - 6 Jun	1309	3745	151.5	24.7	343	603	4	28
9 - 13 Jun	276	7357	160.5	45.8	80	166	0	1
16 - 20 Jun	1784	12255	144	85.1	448	994	0	0
23 - 27 Jun	2015	25747	237	108.6	652	833	0	0
30 Jun - 4 Jul	2655	22825	140	163	135	477	0	0
7 - 11 Jul	606	10959	95	115.4	10	63	15	0
14 - 18 Jul	168	13953	89	156.8	40	46	0	0
21 - 25 Jul	434	22429	98	228.9	52	228	0	5
28 Jul - 1 Aug	533	17371	140.5	123.6	51	290	4	0
4 - 8 Aug	576	19051	140	136	15	242	0	0
11 - 15 Aug	176	23568	165.5	142.4	101	75	0	0
18 - 22 Aug	947	13321	155	85.9	62	655	4	7
25 - 29 Aug	2107	7754	200	39.8	137	1442	0	7

Period	Docs	Pgs	M-Hrs	Pgs/M-Hr	NC	DNGR	UPGR	DECLASS
1-5 Sep	1930	6833	170	40.2	103	1499	0	32
8-12 Sep	1561	6183	150.5	41.1	276	1209	0	12
15-19 Sep	1665	5786	147.5	39.2	459	1142	0	7
22-26 Sep	1354	8376	163.5	51.2	145	1113	0	0
29 Sep-3 Oct	677	11591	179.5	64.6	151	525	2	0
6-10 Oct	277	18133	162.5	111.6	68	187	0	0
13-17 Oct	101	16198	128.5	126.1	78	9	0	0
20-24 Oct	277	13157	151	87.1	81	10	0	0
27-31 Oct	202	21515	163	132	105	19	0	0
3-7 Nov	97	13243	105	126.1	71	0	0	0
10-14 Nov	77	13346	101.5	131	39	16	0	0
17-21 Nov	153	23537	147.2	160	109	43	1	0
24-28 Nov	62	14459	90	160	56	5	0	0
1-5 Dec	267	16516	112.5	147	228	38	0	1
8-12 Dec	476	18655	129.5	144	437	102	0	0
15-19 Dec	171	20436	127.5	160.3	164	6	1	0
22-26 Dec	38	5083	44	115.5	30	8	0	0
29 Dec-2 Jan	125	15450	10.9	141.7	113	12	0	0

TOTALS: 38886* 630271 6594.7 5431.2 6717 23857 157 1391

Total Review Manhours - 6,594.7

Total Documents Reviewed - 38,886

Total Pages Reviewed - 630,271

Average Pages Reviewed Per Manhour - 95.57

Average Manhours Per week - 124.4

CIA Originated Documents Reviewed - 32,120 or 82.6%

Non-CIA Originated Documents Reviewed - 6,766 or 17.4%

Percentage of CIA Documents NO CHANGE - 20.9%

" " " DOWNGRADED - 74.4%

" " " UPGRADED - .49%

Approved For Release 2005/08/24 : CIA-RDP93B01194R001200130008-7
DECLASSIFIED - 4.3%

* Includes folders reviewed as a "document"

Page 3

Average Pages Reviewed Per Week - 11,892

Average Documents Reviewed Per Week - 734

Average Manhours Per Week - 124.4

In One-Half of Weeks, NO Documents Were Declassified

Systematic Review in 1981

<u>Period</u>	<u>Docs</u>	<u>Pgs</u>	<u>M-Hrs</u>	<u>Pgs/M-Hr</u>	<u>NC</u>	<u>DNGR</u>	<u>UPGR</u>	<u>DECL</u>
29/12-2/1	125	15,450	109	141.7	113/90.4	12/9.6	0	0
5/1-9/1	215	20,785	113	184	201/93	16/7	0	0
12/1-16/1	352	26,032	122	213	333/89.0	19/6.1	1/3	21/5.6
19/1-23/1	161	20,691	87	238	134/83	27/17	0	0
26/1-30/1	145	26,033	132.5	196	100/69	45/31	0	0
2/2-6/2	153	25,459	140	182	76/43.9	87/50.3	10/5.8	0
9/2-13/2	65	16,077	128.5	125.1	62/95.3	0	3/4.6	0
16/2-20/2	75	19,997	133.5	149.7	75/100	0	0	0
23/2-27/2	76	19,878	147.5	134.8	76/100	0	0	0
2/3-6/3	77	20,207	160	126.3	77/100	0	0	0
9/3-13/3	90	20,483	141	145.3	90/100	0	0	0
16/3-20/3	93	22,518	170	132.4	93/100	0	0	0
23/3-27/3	143	29,432	176	167.2	128/89.5	15/10.5	0	0
30/3-3/4	120	20,461	129	158.6	120/100	0	0	0
6/4-10/4	79	12,597	84.5	149	64/81	15/19	0	0
13/4-17/4	71	13,403	101	132.70	63/89	8/11	0	0
20/4-24/4	81	10,236	134	76.38	74/91	7/9	0	0
27/4-1/5	88	11,723	127.5	91.94	70/80	18/20	0	0
4/5-8/5	132	17,020	149	114.22	112/85	20/15	0	0
11/5-15/5	97	15,952	150.5	106	96/96	4/4	0	0
25/5-29/5	91	13,945	113	123	81/89	10/11	0	0
18/5-22/5	98	11,692	122.5	95	95/97	3/3	0	0
1/6-5/6	122	19,596	150	130	110/90	12/10	0	0
8/6-12/6	76	11,103	98.5	113	68/89	8/11	0	0
15/6-19/6	160	17,471	68	257	157/98	3/2	0	0
22/6-26/6	175	15,793	112	141	165/93	1/5	10/6.5	0
29/6-3/7	155	16,724	85.5	195	152/98	0	3/2	0
6/7-10/7	67	12,167	90.5	134	61/91	2/3	4/6	0
13/7-17/7	45	10,700	87.5	122	44/98	0	1/2	0
20/7-24/7	58	13,439	55	244	58/100	0	0	0
27/7-31/7	40	7,749	66	117	39/97.5	1/2.5	0	0
3/8-7/8	73	10,990	77	142	56/77	17/23	0	0
10/8-14/8	68	10,983	88	98	44/94	2/3	0	0
17/8-21/8	95	14,424	111	129	82/86	13/14	0	0

<u>Period</u>	<u>Docs</u>	<u>Pgs</u>	<u>M-Hrs</u>	<u>Pgs/H-Hr</u>	<u>NC</u>	<u>DNGR</u>	<u>UPGR</u>	<u>DECL</u>
24/8-28/8	98	14,625	106	137	76/68	28/25	8/7	0
31/8-4/9	70	12,872	103	124	66/94	4/6	0	0
7/9-11/9	56	10,276	83.5	123	56/100	0	0	0
14/9-18/9	106	14,318	103.5	138	106/100	0	0	0
21/9-25/9	81	15,337	110	139	81/100	0	0	0
28/9-2/10	61	12,371	116.5	106	61/100	0	0	0
5/10-9/10	100	15,782	104	151	99/99	1/1	0	0
12/10-16/10	24	4,747	31.5	150	23/96	1/4	0	0
19/10-23/10	42	5,952	57.5	103	40/95	2/5	0	0
26/10-29/10	80	14,836	99	149	80/100	0	0	0
2/11-6/11	49	7,396	84.5	87	49/100	0	0	0
9/11-13/11	49	7,214	64	112	49/100	0	0	0
16/11-20/11	54	11,243	80	140	58/98	1/2	0	0
23/11-27/11	62	12,917	80	161	59/91	4/6	0	2/3
30/11-4/12	163	15,861	98	161	163/99	2/1	0	0
7/12-11/12	21	6,610	58	113	21/100	0	0	0
14/12-18/12	54	7,534	55	136	52/96	2/4	0	0
21/12-25/12	19	2,893	21	137	19/100	0	0	0
1189								

4,950

764,004 pgs

432

23

509 ft @
1500 pgs per ft

8.7
%

.46
%

Summary of OSS Review Team Production 1979-80

	1979	1980	Cumulative Total
1. Total permanent OSS records reviewed	647.00*	948.32	1595.32
2. Amount withheld from total on national security grounds	49.19 (7.6%)	62.10 (6.54%)	111.29 (6.97%)
3. Amount of OSS-originated material in total	599.8 (92.7%)	869.61 (91.7%)	1469.41 (92.1%)
4. Amount withheld from OSS-originated material	49.19 (8.2%)	62.10 (7.1%)	111.29 (7.57%)
5. Amount of Non-OSS originated material in total	47.2 (7.2%)	78.71 (8.29%)	125.91 (7.89%)
* cu ft			
6. Original total of permanent OSS records requiring review	3308.00**		
7. Total reviewed by 31 December 1980	1595.32**		
8. Total remaining to be reviewed	1712.68**		
**These figures are estimates and subject to change.			

OSS Review Team Production1979 and 1980

<u>Year</u>	<u>Total cu ft Reviewed</u>	<u>Withheld</u>	<u>Non-OSS</u>
1979	647.00	49.19	47.20
1980	<u>948.32</u> 1595.32	<u>62.10</u> 111.29	<u>78.71</u> 125.91

6.97 % withheld from total records reviewed

7.89 % non-OSS material

93.03 % released of total material reviewed

1469.41 cu ft of OSS-originated material

7.57 % of OSS-originated material withheld

797.66 cu ft average reviewed per year

OSS Review Team Production1980

<u>month</u>	<u>Total cu ft Reviewed</u>	<u>cu ft Withheld</u>	<u>Non-OSS</u>
Jan	98.00	11.53	9.46
Feb	92.00	6.13	11.42
Mar	117.00	2.32	7.04
Apr	73.00	5.66	2.62
May	87.00	4.88	14.04
Jun	95.00	5.29	5.91
Jul	67.00	6.36	8.37
Aug	161.00	4.14	3.87
Sep	59.00	3.55	7.61
Oct	37.66	3.42	2.25
Nov	28.66	3.02	2.69
Dec	33.00	5.80	3.43
	<u>948.32</u>	<u>62.10</u>	<u>78.71</u>

6.54% withheld from total records reviewed

8.29% non-OSS material

93.46% released of total material reviewed

869.61 cu. ft. of OSS-originated material

7.14% of actual OSS material withheld

79 cu ft reviewed per mo average

Average Jan-Apr 95 ft per mo
6.7% withheld

1979

Month	Total Amount Reviewed cu ft	Amount W. thheld cu ft	Non-OSS cu ft	*
Jan	47	4.95	9.8	15.5
Feb	32	8.68	1.0	15.5
Mar	59	3.37	1.9	10.5
Apr	54	1.02	1.0	10.5
May	41	2.35	1.1	11.0
Jun	42	2.00	4.3	6.3
Jul	17	1.01	0.2	5.0
Aug	84	10.56	5.0	12.3
Sep	88	1.21	8.1	6.2
Oct	57	4.60	0.3	2.0
Nov	50	7.00	0.77	4.5
Dec	76	2.44	1.1	4.2
			103.5	
Totals for 79 :	647	49.19 (7.6%)	47.2 (7.2%)	
Per Mo :	53.9	4.09 (7.5%)	3.9 (7.2%)	

STAT Following from 9 Jan 80 :

Total amount of permanent OSS records: 3308 cu ft
Amount reviewed by OSS team : 862 cu ft
Amount remaining to be reviewed: 2446 cu ft
Projection of how long to complete review: 2.8 years

NOTE: Based on above figure of 647 cu ft reviewed in 1979, projection for how long to complete review : 4.1 years

3308
647 647 4.1 yrs
2661 2661
2588
730

* Mandays spent on Non-Review Work - 103.5
Man-days

Ops Br Production

Aug 78 - May 79

M-H	Pgs	Per hr/Per day	Date
155	2833	18.3/146.4	30/4 - 4/5
176	6332	35.9/287.2	23-22/4
169	2516	14.8/118.4	16-20/4
124	2485	20/160.0	9-13/4
✓ 72	573	7.9/63.2	2-6/4
128	2611	20.4/163.2	26-30/3
120	1347	11.2/89.6	19-23/3
✓ 96	646	6.7/53.6	12-16/3
✓ 112	686	6.1/48.8	5-9/3
✓ 96	483	5/40	26/2 - 2/3
✓ 20	113	5.6/44.8	20-23/2
✓ 72	461	6.4/51.2	5-9/2
↑ 72	762	10.6/84.8	29/1 - 2/2
DCD 72	5330	74/592	22-26/1
DDA 94	6902	73.4/587.2	15-19/1
↓ 100	1284	12.8/102.4	8-12/1
✓ 104	1383	13.3/106.4	2-5/1 1979
<hr/>			
68	1146	16.8/134.4	18-29/12 1978
136	2412	17.7/141.6	11-15/12
144	3333	23.1/184.8	4-8/12

36747

23126

400 3700

112	2625	23.4/187.2	27/11 - 1/12
64	1342	20.9/167.2	20-24/11
100	1224	12.24/97.9	13-17/11
64	1179	18.4/147.2	6-9/11
80	1161	14.5/116	30/10 - 3/11
108	1454	13.4/107.2	23-27/10
108	1693	15.6/124.8	16-20/10
76	1446	19/152	10-13/10
68	1620	23.8/190.4	2-6/10
48	1142	23.8/190.4	25-29/9
144	4236	29.4/235.2	18-22/9
DDO/50	144	9.9/79.2	11-15/9
↓	156	16.4/131.2	5-8/9
	132	16.6/132.8	28/8 - 1/9
	128	2308	18/144
	112	1786	15.9/127.2
	124	1659	13.4/107.2
		20.59/164.72	

hly average 19.07/152.35 daily average

305.6
205.6

3200.0
56371

DCD material:

17.35 hourly average

138.8 daily average

DDA material:

21.85 hourly average

174.8 daily average

DDO 50 Reports:

15.0 hourly average

120.0 daily average

Hourly rate low : 5

Hourly rate high : 74

Daily rate low : 40

Daily rate high : 59.7

28 May 1980

OSS Review Team Production

Period : Jan 79 - Apr 80 (16 months)

Total Cu Ft Reviewed : 1,027

Cu. Ft Withheld : 74.83

Non-OSS Material in Records: 77.74

Average Cu Ft Reviewed per Mo: 64.19

Total OSS Permanent Records: 3,308

Total Remaining to be Reviewed/Apr 80: 2,281

At Average of 64 cuft Reviewed
per mo, will require additional: 35.6 mos
Would complete work in Apr 83.

Notes:

1. Work went slower at first because everyone was learning new procedures. Average per month, therefore, is probably a little low. (In 1980 they average 95 cuft per mo.)
2. Speed of review depends in part on the type of material to be reviewed. Some goes faster than others.
3. Review process can be speeded up in some ways, i.e. withholding documents in groups rather than singly, etc.
4. If 1980 pace continues (95 cuft per mo), work would be completed in 24 mos, or by Apr 82.)

CRB PRODUCTION RATES

Approved For Release 2005/08/24 : CIA-RDP93B01194R001200130008-7

		MARCH 1988									
		MON (2)	TUES (7)	WED (8)	THURS (9)	FRI (10)	MON (13)	TUES (14)	WED (15)	THURS (16)	FRI (17)
STAT 3		111	117	125	141	52 (SHS)	96 (6 HRS) NARS	99 (7 HRS)	95	65 (5 HRS)	
2											
3	015	HA/50	16/8 HRS FOR	FOIA	FOIA	68	23 SHS FOR	113	110	94	
4											
5	012	C-3 RPTS + ANNUAL	MK	MK	MK	22 (2 hrs)	83	3 37	MK	MK	MK
6											
7	016	82	50	86	76	26	113	89	31 (5 hrs)	67	45 (5 hrs)
8			2 hrs FOR	1 hr FOR	2 hrs FOR	4 hrs FOR					
9	017	HAS OF RAB	HAS	HAS	HAS	HAS					
10											
11	018	100	122	124	120	58	133	124	101	92 (2 hrs)	84 (5 hrs)
12											
13	019	64	(8 HRS) 50	48	66	43	67	70	31 (4 HRS)	HAS	HAS
14											
15											
16	007					38 (2)	33	11	14		
17											
18											
19											
20											
21											
22											
23											
24											
25											
26											
27											
28											
29											
30											
31											

DAILY TOTALS

40.9 = 41 mandays
= 4.1 mandays per day

41 400.4
369
314
86

41 400.4
369
314
86

Approved For Release 2005/08/24 : CIA-RDP93B01194R001200130008-7